

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Claim 17 has been amended to cure an informality. Claims 1, 20 and 34 also have been amended. Claims 1 – 32 and 34 – 39 are currently pending.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 – 2, 5 – 6, 20, 22, 34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edelman, US Patent No. 5,680,563 (“Edelman”), in view of Bolnick, *et al.*, US Patent No. 5,838,317 (“Bolnick”). Claims 3 – 4, 7 – 19, 21, 23 – 32, 35 and 37 – 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edelman in view of Bolnick, and in further view of Engst (“iPhoto 2 for Mac OS X: Visual Quickstart Guide”, Copyright 04/21/2003, Peachpit Press).

Claims 1 – 2, 5 – 6, 20, 22, 34 and 36

Claims 1 – 2, 5 – 6, 20, 22, 34 and 36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edelman in view of Bolnick. Independent claims 1, 20 and 34 have been amended in response to this rejection. Claim 1, as amended, now requires the item grouping component to “utilize said one or more group characteristics [shared by the items in a group] to generate one or more group titles for at least a portion of said plurality of groups.” Similarly, amended claim 20 “generates one or more group titles for at least a portion of said groups, wherein said one or more group titles indicate at least one characteristic shared by the filtered images in one of said groups.” Amended claim 34 now recites “generating one or more group titles for at least a portion of said plurality of groups, wherein said one or more group titles indicate at least one characteristic shared by the filtered items in one of said plurality of groups.”

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Edelman nor Bolnick teach these limitations of amended independent claims 1, 20 and 34.

Edelman teaches a filtering framework in an object-oriented operating system. Using the interface taught by Edelman, a user can filter which items are presented. For example, the user may select to view all of the items or may choose to view only one type of item. See FIGS. 6 and 7. After the filtering operation, Edelman displays selected items, while representing the non-selected items as a single icon. Importantly, Edelman is silent concerning the generation of group titles indicating an underlying characteristic shared by the items in a group. For example, while Edelman displays a bundle of non-selected items with a label “3 other items,” such a title, of course, does not indicate any common, shared characteristic present in each of the grouped “other” items.

Bolnick also does not teach the generation of titles indicating a characteristic shared by grouped items. Bolnick teaches a method for arranging icons on a display screen. Bolnick allows the user to design a screen layout organized as one or more frames. Each frame includes at least one filter for limiting the types of icons presented within the frame. For example, a filter may allow only “document” type files to be associated with a particular frame. While the Bolnick’s frames are displayed with titles, Bolnick relies on the user to provide these titles, and the titles are not generated by the computer. See, e.g., Bolnick, col 6, l. 64 – col. 7, l. 6.

In sum, neither Edelman nor Bolnick teach or suggest a computer system that utilizes a group characteristic shared by items of a group to generate a group title for display with the group. This computer-generated title indicates “at least one group characteristic” shared by the items in the group. Therefore, neither Edelman nor Bolnick, either alone or in combination

teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 20 and 34. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 20 and 34 are in condition for allowance.

Applicants further submit that dependent claims 2, 5 and 6, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants further submit that dependent claim 22, which depends from claim 20, is in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 20. Applicants further submit that dependent claim 36, which depends from claim 34, is in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 34.

Dependent Claims 3 – 4, 7 – 19, 21, 23 – 32, 35 and 37 – 39

Dependent claims 3 – 4, 7 – 19, 21, 23 – 32, 35 and 37 – 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edelman in view of Bolnick, and in further view of Engst. Claims 3 – 4, 7 – 19, 21, 23 – 32, 35 and 37 – 39 each depend from either independent claims 1, 20 or 34. As discussed above, claims 1, 20 and 34 are patentable over the combination of Edelman and Bolnick. Engst also fails to disclose the invention of claims 1, 20 and 34, individually or in combination with Edelman and Bolnick. Claims 3 – 4, 7 – 19, 21, 23 – 32, 35 and 37 – 39 include all of the limitations of either claim 1, 20 or 34 and, thus, are also patentable over Edelman, Engst and Bolnick, taken separately or in combination with one another, for at least the reasons stated above.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, claims 1 – 32 and 34 - 39 are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/rhr/ Robert H. Reckers

Robert H. Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547